



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

editor prefaces the original text with an instructive introduction supplemented profusely by citations principally from original sources. The Abridgment itself is amplified by explanatory notes.

Union Portraits. By Gamaliel Bradford. Pp. 330. Illustrated. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Co.

In this volume Mr. Bradford continues his series of biographical studies with "portraits" of nine Union leaders of Civil War times. Lee, the American, as well as Confederate Portraits are familiar works by the same author. He has selected as representative men of the North, Generals McClellan, Hooker, Meade, Thomas, and Sherman, and Secretaries Stanton and Seward, and Charles Sumner and Samuel Bowles. We look in vain for Sheridan. The biographies of Hooker and McClellan are substantially those first published in the *Atlantic Monthly*. Mr. Bradford finds his materials in the writings of the men themselves and in those of their contemporaries to which he makes frequent reference. His appreciation of the characters and achievements of the northern generals, still the subject of controversy, are impartial and fair. It is not necessary to state that the author knows the Civil War period and its literature.

The "portrait" of the brilliant organizer but unsuccessful soldier, Gen. McClellan, is a composite of his many admirable qualities and excessive self-confidence. McClellan's supporters—and they are many—are never so enthusiastic as the General himself, and their praise is frequently "in the nature of an apology and lacks entirely the trumpet tone with which the General proclaims his own feats of arms." There is abundant testimony of the high regard and loving devotion of the Army of the Potomac for their leader. Although McClellan had ability, he lacked enterprise, and had he been a subordinate under men of the stamp of Grant, Sheridan or Thomas his campaigns would doubtless have been more successful. Mr. Bradford is just in saying: "He was a man of real power given too great an opportunity. As an able soldier, true patriot, and loyal gentleman, he did what he could."

"Fighting Joe" Hooker, so-named, as the author tells us, not by his troops but in pure accident by a newspaper compositor,

was a thoroughly human figure. He was a great organizer, surpassed only by McClellan, and he could plan campaigns ably, but lacked the ability to execute them. It was he who wrote, "We lost no honors at Chancellorsville," while Lincoln, "fell on his knees and told his God that the country could not endure another Fredericksburg or Chancellorsville." This is characteristic of Hooker. His confidence in himself and his inability to admit failure did not desert him. Hooker was unpopular with his associates because of his hasty speech and habits of criticizing and fault-finding; yet Lincoln said of him, "When trouble arises I can always rely on Hooker's magnanimity."

General Meade is a difficult person to understand and his personality and inability to win men make him less well known than other generals whose achievements were not so great. The casual student remembers only that he took a defeated army and in three days successfully met and stopped the hitherto victorious forces of Lee in the great battle of Gettysburg. Meade was a man of peace; he was modest, quiet, and unassuming yet not without substantial qualities making for success. "He was surely the man who fought Gettysburg. After all perhaps, that is something."

Gen. Thomas, like Lee, a Virginian, was confronted with the choice of serving either his native state or the Union, but unlike Lee he found his duty lay in service to the nation. For this he has been in turn criticized and commended by his biographers. Mr. Bradford argues that before Sumter he was undecided as to the course of his future allegiance. In Thomas we see the exercise of self-control and reserve in all things and at all times and an analysis of his character and motives is difficult. Yet notwithstanding his punctiliousness and exaggerated conception of the dignity of his position, he was kind of heart and tender of emotion on the rare occasions when he permitted himself the liberty of natural expression.

The author writes of Sherman: "He wore his coat unbuttoned and his heart also, exposed the inmost linings to all the winds of heaven. . . . This exposure is almost as baffling as Thomas's concealment, though in another fashion. We like to see a soul clean and wind-blown. But I am not sure that we always like to see it thrashing on the clothesline." This quotation is illustrative of the perspective of the author, and makes us believe

that in "Portraits" he has selected an expressive title for his work.

Of the biographies of Stanton, Seward, Sumner and Bowles, that of Stanton is the least cheering, but he was not found to be a very agreeable person by those who knew him. The author suggests that the Secretary of War was perhaps the only member of Lincoln's Cabinet who was not politically ambitious. He discounts the contention of many that Stanton was a personal coward, and holds that the true appreciation of this unusual character lies in the fact that "under all tactlessness and all indiscretion there lay the one passionate masterful purpose, to fight over all things and through all things and beyond all things that the inheritors of the American Revolution on this continent might find one indissoluble, prosperous, peaceful nation, the United States of America."

Seward was a natural politician, a popular orator, and without doubt the ablest and most influential member of Lincoln's and Johnson's Cabinets. Yet there appears to be a vein of insincerity, a hidden purpose, in what was said and done by this many-sided man. Mr. Bradford finds his key to the secrets of Seward's career in his "artistic temperament," which enabled him to view what was going on about him as a spectacle in which he stood apart.

Charles Sumner is described as a man who "had a magnificent tongue and one idea, the abolition of slavery. . . . He was simply the vocal organ of one of the greatest moral movements of the world."

Weed, Greeley, Garrison, Dana, and Raymond have left wider reputations as journalists, but the author has selected Samuel Bowles, Editor of the *Springfield Republican*, as the study best suitable to conclude this series. Bowles was sympathetic, yet uncompromising. He developed a struggling weekly into a great modern newspaper whose power he appreciated both as a moulder of opinion and disseminator of news. His biographers agree that he was given to faultfinding and grumbling, and he frequently used his own paper for personal attacks. Yet withal his editorials and letters were eagerly read and given a general circulation, and in Springfield there was public mourning for his death.

It is evident that Mr. Bradford makes no special plea for the distinguished men about whom he has written: His effort is

rather at an estimate of their characters and services. The student of American political history will find "Union Portraits" interesting and instructive reading. A chronology precedes each chapter and a bibliography with notes is appended.

The Postal Power of Congress, A Study in Constitutional Expansion. By Lindsay Rogers, Ph.D., LL.B., Adjunct Professor of Political Science in the University of Virginia. Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, Series XXXIV, No. 2. Pp. 180.

The purpose of this scholarly essay is "to trace the legislative and judicial history of the grant to Congress of the power 'to establish post offices and post roads,' and to discuss the constitutionality of the proposals that, under this clause, Federal control may be extended to subjects over which Congress has no direct authority." The study is one in constitutional interpretation rather than of the efficiency or development of the post office system. The author has revised and he republishes as a part of this volume his articles which have appeared in the law reviews of Harvard, Yale and the Virginia University law schools.

Chapter I. treats briefly of the attempts at regulation of the inefficient postal service in the colonies; the work of Benjamin Franklin, first as postmaster-general at Philadelphia, and later as postmaster-general of the Colonies; and the faulty organization and control under the Articles of Confederation. The grant of postal power received little consideration in either the Constitutional Convention or in the ratifying conventions of the several States. It was generally accepted that the postal service was by nature monopolistic and should therefore be under the exclusive power of the Federal Government. It cannot be urged, however, that the controverted powers later exercised under this clause were contemplated by the framers or "within the range of possibility" when the Constitution was adopted.

In Chapters II. and III. are discussed the power of Congress to establish post offices and post roads, the legislative acts and their judicial interpretations, and the various crimes and prohibited acts under Federal postal statutes. We are particularly interested in the ample treatment by Dr. Rogers and in his conclusions concerning the authority of the Postmaster-General to exclude